

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/008,704	12/06/2001	Sang-Ho Ahn	9903-045	8392	
7	590 06/30/2005	EXAMINER			
MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C. 1030 S.W. Morrison Street Portland, OR 97205			TRAN, TAN N		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2826		
			DATE MAILED: 06/30/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/008,704	AHN ET AL.	
Examiner .	Art Unit	
TAN N. TRAN	2826	

Advisory Action	10/008,704 AHN ET AL.					
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	TAN N. TRAN	2826				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 15 June 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP		•				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL						
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for						
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		jected claims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).		•				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	□ will not be entered, or b) ☑ wivided below or appended.	ill be entered and an	explanation of			
Claim(s) allowed: <u>20-29,50,51,71-80,82-101,116,118,120</u> Claim(s) objected to:	0 <u>-126,128-132 and 134-142</u> .					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>55-64,66-70 and 133</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	ut before or on the date of filing a New sufficient reasons why the affidate	Notice of Appeal will <u>r</u> vit or other evidence i	not be entered is necessary			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to c showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar. 10. The affidavit are the available in the same and t	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a (1).			
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but the reconsideration has been considered but th						
See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).		No(s).				
13. Other:	, , ,	Minhloan	tonton			
		Primary Ex				
		Filliary EX	ailliler			

Art Unit 2826

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed 06/15/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

It is argued, at pages 15,16 of the remarks, that "The applicant requests, in accordance with MPEP 706.07(d), withdrawal of the finality of the Office Action mailed on June 2, 2005 as being premature. A second or any subsequent action on the merits should not be made final if it includes a rejection, on prior art not of record, of any claim amended to include limitations which should reasonably have been expected to be claimed" and "In line 8, it reasonable to expect that each of the electrode pads might be "directly" coupled to a corresponding lead with a bonding wire, since allowed claim 71 already recites that "the bonding wires are directly connected to the portion of the inner leads". However, claim 71 is allowable because none of the references disclose or can be combined to yield the claimed invention such as the peripheral part protruding away from the die pad chip attaching part only in a direction away from the semiconductor chip as recited in reason for allowance in page 6 of previous office action sent on 06/02/05, but not allowable because of the bonding wires are directly connected to the portion of the inner leads. Moreover, the independent claim 71 does not belong to the independent claim 55, and the new matter that applicant added to claim 55 is each of the electrode pads directly coupled to a corresponding lead with a bonding wire. Thus, the amended portion in claim 55 raises new issue that would require further consideration and/or search. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in the previous Office action. Accordingly, the previous office action was made final. See MPEP § 706.07(a).